arXiv:1201.4551v2 [stat.AP] 24 Jan 2012

Fossil fuel consumption and economic growth: causality relationship in the world

Hazuki ISHIDA*

Fukushima University, Faculty of Symbiotic Systems Science, 1, Kanayagawa, Fukushima, Japan

---

Abstract

This paper analyzes cointegration and causality between fossil fuel consumption and economic growth in the world over the period 1971–2008. The estimation results indicate that fossil fuel consumption and GDP are cointegrated and there exists long-run unidirectional causality from fossil fuel consumption to GDP. This paper also investigates the nexus between nonfossil energy consumption and GDP, and shows that there is no causality between the variables. The conclusions are that reducing fossil fuel consumption may hamper economic growth, and that it is unlikely that nonfossil energy will substantially replace fossil fuels.

Keywords: Fossil fuels, Economic growth, Cointegration, Granger causality, Time series analysis

---

1. Introduction

From the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, fossil fuels have been major sources of energy supply, and we are still in the age of fossil fuels. They provide over 80 percent of world consumption of primary energy, in spite of our strong anxiety over their dominance. Obviously, any societies relying on fossil fuels are not sustainable. Then, is it possible that our prosperity could continue without extensive use of fossil fuels? Many optimists' answer to this question may rely on the possibility of harnessing renewable energy on a larger scale than ever. However, it is wrong to believe that renewable energy

---

*Corresponding author. Tel.:+81 24 548 8439

Email address: `e059@ipc.fukushima-u.ac.jp` (Hazuki ISHIDA)

can fully replace fossil fuels because there is a fundamental difference between fossil fuels and renewable energy as suggested by Georgescu-Roegen (1971), that is, fossil fuels are stock-type resources that can be extracted at a rate to suit our wishes, while renewable energy sources from which preindustrial societies mainly derived their energy are basically of the flow type, and we cannot control the rate of its flow as we would like. The difference between these two energy sources should be clearly recognized when we try to explain the process of economic evolution. We can control the rate of utilization of fossil fuels, while renewables dictate to us. So it is natural that fossil fuels and renewables are primarily associated with industry and agriculture, respectively (Georgescu-Roegen, 1971). Furthermore, fossil fuels have other advantages including the following: high energy density, high energy return on energy invested (ERoEI), low cost, ease of transport and distribution, ease of combustion, and high flexibility in providing several forms of secondary energy, although these are not necessarily independent of each other. In particular, fossil fuels exert a strong influence on the transportation sector. In very few countries in the world do fossil fuels account for less than 97 percent of transportation fuel use (Fulton, 2004). This is because fossil fuels are easily transported, mainly because of their high energy density per volume, and are easy to handle and burn, which means that heavy equipment need not be installed in transportation containers. In light of these overwhelming advantages, we should not place fossil fuels on the same level as other fuels, and should focus more on the relationship between fossil fuel consumption and economic growth.

There have been several studies of causal relationships between economic growth and a particular type of fossil fuel, such as oil or coal (Lee & Chang, 2005; Zou & Chau, 2006; Zamani, 2007; Yuan et al., 2008). However, the results of these studies are insufficient to understand the role of fossil fuels in the economy as a whole. Although oil, coal, and natural gas have distinctive characteristics, these are sharing the specific advantages of fossil fuels as mentioned above. Historically, it is clear that since the Industrial Revolution, oil, coal, and natural gas are, if not perfectly substitutable for each other, are widely substitutable.

This paper investigates the relationship between fossil fuel consumption and economic growth worldwide. [1] Although most related studies have been conducted on a country-by-country basis, it is difficult to know the real value of energy consumption of each country unless they are economically isolated from each other. Most countries consume energy not only directly but also indirectly through imports of several kinds of products that require more or less energy in the manufacturing process. This indirect energy use is usually excluded from the country-by-country statistics of energy consumption. The easiest way to avoid this problem is to conduct a study worldwide.

---

[1] Although uranium ore deposits are terrestrial stocks just like fossil fuels, there are

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the methodology and data used in the paper. Section 3 reports the results of econometric analyses. Section 4 concludes.

2. Methodology and data

This paper uses per capita global real GDP (Y hereafter), per capita fossil fuel consumption (FF), and per capita nonfossil energy consumption (NE). These time series are calculated using data obtained from *World Development Indicators (WDI) 2011* published by the World Bank for the period 1971–2008. All variables are expressed in logarithmic form.

In this paper, I use the vector error correction approach to test the direction of the causality relationship between the variables. To avoid the problem of estimating a spurious regression, I first test the stationarity of the variables by employing the augmented Dickey–Fuller (ADF) test (Dickey & Fuller, 1979) and the KPSS test (Kwaitowski et al., 1992). If some variables are nonstationary, there is a possibility that one or more cointegration relationships among the variables exist (Engle & Granger, 1987). In the next step, therefore, the Johansen and Juselius maximum likelihood test (Johansen & Juselius, 1990) is conducted to test for cointegration between the variables based on

---

some essential differences between these two types of energy resources as follows. First, differing from fossil fuels, uranium ore is not a low entropy resource, and it needs to be enriched to increase the exergy content by the consumption of other low entropy resources such as fossil fuels. Second, uranium ore cannot be burned as easily as fossil fuels; highly complex systems are needed to harness uranium. Finally, nuclear energy can only supply electricity that is relatively inflexible to changing demands of people for that and other forms of energy. Hence, uranium ore should not be treated as a primary energy source offering the same level of convenience as fossil fuels.

a VAR model as specified in Eq.(1):

$$X_t = \mu + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \Pi_i X_{t-i} + \epsilon_t, \qquad (1)$$

where X is a vector of variables, μ is a vector of constant terms, Π are coefficient matrices, p is the number of lags, and ϵ is a vector of the disturbance term with a mean of zero. By reparameterizing Eq. (1), the corresponding VECM is obtained:

$$\Delta X_t = \mu + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \Gamma_i \Delta X_{t-i} + \Pi X_{t-1} + \epsilon_t, \qquad (2)$$

where Δ means first difference, $\Pi = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \Pi_i - I$, and $\Gamma_i = -\sum_{j=i+1}^{p} \Pi_j$. By checking the rank of Π, the existence of a long-run relationship between the variables can be detected. Finally, a causality test is conducted based on VECM, following Granger (1988).

To determine the number of variables to be examined is not an easy task. So far, most studies of the causal relationship between energy and economic activity have used bivariate models. Like previous studies, I employ the bivariate approach, namely, Y and FF (Y and NE) causality tests.

3. Empirical results

The results of the ADF and KPSS tests are reported in Table 1. For all the three variables in levels,@ the ADF test cannot reject the null hypothesis that there is a unit root, and the KPSS test does reject the null hypothesis that the variable is stationary. On the other hand, after taking the first differences, the ADF test can reject the null hypothesis and the KPSS test cannot reject the null hypothesis for each variable. The results imply that each variable is nonstationary and integrated of order one.

Next, to determine the number of cointegrating relationships, the maximum likelihood estimation method of Johansen & Juselius (1990) is employed. The results of cointegration tests between fossil fuel consumption and GDP are presented in Table 2. Both the maximum eigenvalue and the trace statistics suggest the existence of one cointegrating vector between the variables.

As suggested by Engle & Granger (1987), if cointegration exists between two variables, there must be either unidirectional or bidirectional causality

Table 1: Results of unit root tests

Variable	ADF t-statistic		KPSS LM statistic	
	Level	First difference	Level	First difference
Y	-0.131	-4.015***	0.753***	0.139
FF	-1.577	-4.119***	0.144*	0.215
NE	-1.679	-4.694***	0.170**	0.099

*, **, *** indicate significance at the 10%, 5%, 1% levels, respectively.

Table 2: Cointegration estimation results between fossil fuel consumption and GDP

Cointegration rank	Trace test		Maximum eigenvalue test	
	Statistics	Critical value[a]	Statistics	Critical value[a]
None	22.0556	18.397	20.154	17.148
At most 1	1.902	3.841	1.902	3.841

[a] 5% Critical value.

between the variables. Table 3 shows the results of the Granger causality tests between fossil fuel consumption and GDP. The results suggest that there is unidirectional long-run causality running from fossil fuel consumption to GDP.

Table 3: Estimation results of the Granger causality test for fossil fuel consumption and GDP

Dependent variables	Short-run		Long-run
	χ^2 statistics		T statistics
	ΔY	ΔFF	*ECT*
ΔY	-	1.867	-3.109***
ΔFF	1.101	-	-0.666

*, **, *** indicate significance at the 10%, 5%, 1% levels, respectively.

On the other hand, as shown in Table 4, the results of cointegration tests between nonfossil energy consumption and GDP suggest that there is no cointegrating relationship between the variables. In the absence of cointegration, the standard Granger causality test can be applied. Table 5 shows the results of the Granger causality tests between nonfossil energy consumption and GDP. The results indicate that there is no causal relationship between the two variables.

Table 4: Cointegration estimation results between nonfossil energy consumption and GDP

Cointegration rank	Trace test		Maximum eigenvalue test	
	Statistics	Critical value[a]	Statistics	Critical value[a]
None	22.054	25.872	14.918	19.387
At most 1	7.136	12.518	7.136	12.518

[a] 5% Critical value.

Table 5: Estimation results of the Granger causality test for nonfossil energy consumption and GDP

Dependent variables	Short-run		Long-run
	χ^2 statistics		T-statistics
	ΔY	ΔNE	*ECT*
ΔY	-	1.912	-
ΔNE	0.153	-	-

*, **, *** indicate significance at the 10%, 5%, 1% levels, respectively.

In sum, it is clear that fossil fuels have been important factors spurring global economic growth. There is a view that any society that depends heavily upon fossil fuels cannot be sustainable. People who think that the global economy can continue to grow without fossil fuels have high hopes for harnessing renewable energy more widely than before. However, the results presented in this paper imply that nonfossil energy is not likely to play much the same role as fossil fuels in promoting global economic growth.

4. Conclusion

This paper investigates the relationship between fossil fuel consumption and economic growth in the world based on a bivariate model. Using the Johansen cointegration technique, its empirical results indicate a relationship between the variables. The results of Granger causality tests based on a vector error-correction model reveal unidirectional long-run causality running from fossil fuel consumption to GDP. This paper also investigates the nexus between nonfossil energy consumption and GDP, and shows that there is no obvious causality between the variables. These results imply that fossil fuels are important factors to promote economic growth, and it is difficult to achieve both departure from dependence on fossil fuels and ongoing global economic growth simultaneously.

References

Dickey, D. A., & Fuller, W. A. (1979). Distribution of the estimation for autoregressive time series with a unit root. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *74*, 427–431.

Engle, R. F., & Granger, C. W. J. (1987). Cointegration and error correction: representation, estimation and testing. *Econometrica*, *55*, 251–276.

Fulton, L. (2004). Reducing oil consumption in transporting: combining three approaches. *IEA/EET Working Paper*, *EET/2004/01*, 1–24.

Georgescu-Roegen, N. (1971). *The Entropy Law and the Economic Process*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Granger, C. W. J. (1988). Some recent developments in a concept of causality. *Journal of Econometrics*, *39*, 199–211.

Johansen, S., & Juselius, K. (1990). Maximum likelihood estimation and inference on cointegration –with applications to the demand for money. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, *52*, 169–210.

Kwaitowski, D., Phillips, P. C. B., Schmidt, P., & Shin, Y. (1992). Testing the null hypothesis of stationarity against the alternative of a unit root: how sure are we that economic time series have a unit root. *Journal of Econometrics*, *54*, 159–178.

Lee, C., & Chang, C. (2005). Structural breaks, energy consumption, and economic growth revisited: evidence from Taiwan. *Energy Economics*, *27*, 857–872.

Yuan, J., Kang, J., Zhao, C., & Hu, Z. (2008). Energy consumption and economic growth: evidence from China at both aggregated and disaggregated levels. *Energy Economics*, *30*, 3077–3094.

Zamani, M. (2007). Energy consumption and economic activities in Iran. *Energy Economics*, *29*, 1135–1140.

Zou, G., & Chau, K. W. (2006). Short- and long-run effects between oil consumption and economic growth in China. *Energy Policy*, *34*, 3644–3655.